Interlacing Families I: Bipartite Ramanujan Graphs of All Degrees *

Adam Marcus
Yale University

Daniel A. Spielman
Yale University

Nikhil Srivastava
Microsoft Research, India

April 16, 2013

Abstract

We prove that there exist infinite families of regular bipartite Ramanujan graphs of every degree bigger than 2. We do this by proving a variant of a conjecture of Bilu and Linial about the existence of good 2-lifts of every graph.

We also establish the existence of infinite families of 'irregular Ramanujan' graphs, whose eigenvalues are bounded by the spectral radius of their universal cover. Such families were conjectured to exist by Linial and others. In particular, we prove the existence of infinite families of (c, d)-biregular bipartite graphs with all non-trivial eigenvalues bounded by $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$, for all $c, d \geq 3$.

Our proof exploits a new technique for demonstrating the existence of useful combinatorial objects that we call the "method of interlacing polynomials".

---

1 Introduction

Ramanujan graphs have been the focus of substantial study in Theoretical Computer Science and Mathematics. They are graphs whose non-trivial adjacency matrix eigenvalues are as small as possible. Previous constructions of Ramanujan graphs have been sporadic, only producing Ramanujan graphs of particular degrees. In this paper, we prove a variant of a conjecture of Bilu and Linial [BL06], and use it to realize an approach they suggested for constructing bipartite Ramanujan graphs of every degree.

   Our main technique involves a novel existence argument. The conjecture of Bilu and Linial requires us to prove that every graph has a signed adjacency matrix with all of its eigenvalues in a small range. We do this by proving that the roots of the expected characteristic polynomial of a randomly signed adjacency matrix lie in this range. This would appear to be useless, as the roots of a sum of polynomials do not necessarily have anything to do with the roots of the polynomials in the sum. However, there seem to be many sums of combinatorial polynomials for which this intuition is wrong. The polynomials in our sum form what we call an "interlacing family". Using a technique that we call the the "method of interlacing polynomials", we show that an interlacing family always contains a polynomial whose largest root is at most the largest root of the sum.

   We bound the largest root of the sum of the characteristic polynomials of the signed adjacency matrices of a graph by observing that this sum is the well-studied matching polynomial of the graph.

2 Technical Introduction and Preliminaries

2.1 Ramanujan Graphs

Ramanujan graphs are defined in terms of the eigenvalues of their adjacency matrices. If G is a d-regular graph and A is its adjacency matrix, then d is always an eigenvalue of A. The matrix A has an eigenvalue of $-d$ if and only if G is bipartite. The eigenvalues of d, and $-d$ when G is bipartite, are called the *trivial* eigenvalues of A. Following Lubotzky, Phillips and Sarnak [LPS88], we say that a $d-$regular graph is *Ramanujan* if all of its non-trivial eigenvalues lie between $-2\sqrt{d-1}$ and $2\sqrt{d-1}$. It is easy to construct Ramanujan graphs with a small number of vertices: d-regular complete graphs and complete bipartite graphs are Ramanujan. The challenge is to construct an infinite family of d-regular graphs that are all Ramanujan. One cannot construct infinite families of d-regular graphs whose eigenvalues lie in a smaller range: the Alon–Boppana bound (see [Nil91]) tells us that for every constant $\epsilon > 0$, every sufficiently large d-regular graph has a non-trivial eigenvalue with absolute value at least $2\sqrt{d-1} - \epsilon$.

   Lubotzky, Phillips and Sarnak [LPS88] and Margulis [Mar88] were the first to construct Ramanujan graphs. They built both bipartite and non-bipartite Ramanujan graphs from Cayley graphs. All of their graphs are regular and have degrees $p+1$ where p is a prime. There have been very few other constructions of Ramanujan graphs [Piz90, Chi92, JL97, Mor94]. To the best of our knowledge, the only degrees for which infinite families of Ramanujan graphs were previously known to exist were those of the form $q+1$ where q is a prime power. Lubotzky [Lub94, Problem 10.7.3] asked whether there exist infinite families of Ramanujan graphs of every degree greater than 2. We resolve this conjecture in the affirmative in the bipartite case.

2.2 2-Lifts

Bilu and Linial [BL06] suggested constructing Ramanujan graphs through a sequence of 2-lifts of a base graph. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, a 2-lift of G is a graph that has two vertices for each vertex in V. This pair of vertices is called the *fibre* of the original vertex. Every edge in E also corresponds to two edges in the 2-lift. If (u, v) is an edge in E, $\{u_0, u_1\}$ is the fibre of u, and $\{v_0, v_1\}$ is the fibre of v, then the 2-lift can either contain the pair of edges

$$\{(u_0, v_0), (u_1, v_1)\}, \text{or} \tag{1}$$

$$\{(u_0, v_1), (u_1, v_0)\}. \tag{2}$$

If only edge pairs of the first type appear, then the 2-lift is just two disjoint copies of the original graph. If only edge pairs of the second type appear, then we obtain the *double-cover* of G. To determine the eigenvalues of a 2-lift, Bilu and Linial introduce *signings* of the edges of G: $s : E \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$. They place signings in one-to-one correspondence with 2-lifts by setting $s(u, v) = 1$ if edges of type (1) appear in the 2-lift, and $s(u, v) = -1$ if edges of type (2) appear.

To analyze the eigenvalues of a 2-lift, they define the signed adjacency matrix A_s to be the same as the adjacency matrix of G, except that the entries corresponding to an edge (u, v) are $s(u, v)$. They prove [BL06, Lemma 3.1] that the eigenvalues of the 2-lift are the union, taken with multiplicity, of the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of A and of the signed adjacency matrix of A. Following Friedman [Fri03], they refer to the eigenvalues of A as the *old eigenvalues* and the eigenvalues of the signed adjacency matrix as the *new eigenvalues*. They prove that every graph of maximal degree d has a signing in which all of the new eigenvalues have absolute value at most $O(\sqrt{d \log^3 d})$. They then build d-regular expander graphs by repeatedly taking 2-lifts of a complete graph on $d + 1$ vertices.

Bilu and Linial conjectured that every d-regular graph has a signing in which all of the new eigenvalues have absolute value at most $2\sqrt{d-1}$. If one applied the corresponding 2-lifts to the d-regular complete graph, one would obtain an infinite sequence of d-regular Ramanujan graphs. We prove a weak version of Bilu and Linial's conjecture: every d-regular graph has a signing in which all of the new eigenvalues are at most $2\sqrt{d-1}$. The difference between our result and the original conjecture is that we do not control the smallest new eigenvalue. This is why we consider bipartite graphs. The eigenvalues of the adjacency matrices of bipartite graphs are symmetric about zero (see, for example, [God93, Theorem 2.4.2]) So, a bound on the smallest non-trivial eigenvalue follows from a bound on the largest. We also use the fact that a 2-lift of a bipartite graph is also bipartite. By applying the corresponding 2-lifts to the d-regular complete bipartite graph, we obtain an infinite sequence of d-regular bipartite Ramanujan graphs.

2.3 Irregular Ramanujan Graphs and Universal Covers

We say that a bipartite graph is (c, d)-biregular if all vertices on one side of the bipartition have degree c and all vertices on the other side have degree d. The adjacency matrix of a (c, d)-biregular graph always has eigenvalues $\pm\sqrt{cd}$; these are its trivial eigenvalues. Feng and Li [FL96] (see also [LS96]) prove a generalization of the Alon–Boppana bound that applies to (c, d)-biregular graphs: for all $\epsilon > 0$, all sufficiently large (c, d)-biregular graphs have a non-trivial eigenvalue with absolute value at least $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1} - \epsilon$. Thus, we say that a (c, d)-biregular graph is Ramanujan if all of its non-trivial eigenvalues are at most $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$. We prove the existence of infinite families of (c, d)-biregular Ramanujan graphs for all $c, d \geq 3$.

The regular and biregular Ramanujan graphs discussed above are actually special cases of a more general phenomenon. To describe it, we will require a construction known as the *universal cover*. The universal cover of a graph G is the infinite tree T such that every connected lift of G is a quotient of the tree. Following [HLW06], it can be defined concretely by first fixing a "root" vertex v_0, and then placing one vertex in T for every non-backtracking walk $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ starting at v_0, where a walk is non-backtracking if $v_{i-1} \neq v_{i+1}$ for all i. Two vertices of T are adjacent if and only if one is a simple extension of another, i.e., the edges of T are all of the form $(v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_\ell) \sim (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_\ell, v_{\ell+1})$. The universal cover of a graph is unique up to isomorphism, independent of the choice of v_0

The adjacency matrix A_T of the universal cover T is an infinite-dimensional symmetric matrix. We will be interested in the *spectral radius* $\rho(T)$ of T, which may be defined[1] as:

$$\rho(T) := \sup_{\|x\|_2 = 1} \|A_T x\|_2 \tag{3}$$

where $\|x\|_2^2 := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x(i)^2$ whenever the series converges. Naturally, the spectral radius of a finite tree is defined to be the norm of its adjacency matrix.

With these notions in hand, we can state the definition of an irregular Ramanujan graph. Greenberg and Lubotzky [Gre95] (see also [Cio06]) prove that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every infinite family of graphs that have the same universal cover T, all sufficiently large graphs in the family have an eigenvalue with absolute value at least $\rho(T) - \epsilon$. Correspondingly, Hoory, Linial, and Wigderson [HLW06, Definition 6.7] define an arbitrary graph to be Ramanujan if all of its non-trivial eigenvalues are less than the spectral radius of its universal cover.

The universal cover of any d-regular graph is the infinite d-ary tree, whereas the universal cover of any (c, d)-biregular graph is the infinite tree in which the degrees alternate between c and d on every other level [LS96]. The former tree is known to have spectral radius $2\sqrt{d-1}$ while the latter has a spectral radius of $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$ (see [GM88, LS96]). Thus, a definition based on universal covers generalizes both the regular and biregular definitions of Ramanujan graphs, and the bound of Greenberg and Lubotzky generalizes both the Alon-Boppana and Feng-Li bounds.

In this general setting, we show that every bipartite graph G has a 2-lift in which all of the new eigenvalues are less than the spectral radius of its universal cover. Applying these 2-lifts inductively to any finite bipartite irregular Ramanujan graph yields an infinite family of irregular Ramanujan graphs whose degree distribution matches that of the initial graph. In particular, applying them to the (c, d)-biregular complete bipartite graph yields an infinite family of (c, d)-biregular Ramanujan graphs. As far as we know, infinite families of irregular Ramanujan graphs were not known to exist prior to this work.

2.4 Related Work

There have been many studies of random lifts of graphs. For some results on the spectra of random lifts, we point the reader to [ALM02, LR05, AL06, LP10, ABG10, LSV11]. Friedman [Fri08] has proved that almost every d-regular graph almost meets the Ramanujan bound: he

---

[1]In functional analysis, the spectral radius of an infinite-dimensional operator A is traditionally defined to be the largest λ for which $(A - \lambda I)$ is unbounded. However, in the case of self-adjoint operators, this definition is equivalent to the one presented here (see, for example, Theorem VI.6 in [RS80]).

shows that for every $\epsilon > 0$ the absolute value of all the non-trivial eigenvalues of almost every sufficiently large d-regular graph are at most $2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon$. In the irregular case, Puder [Pud12] has shown that with high probability a high-order lift of a graph G has new eigenvalues that are bounded in absolute value by $\sqrt{3}\rho$, where ρ is the spectral radius of the universal cover of G.

We remark that constructing bipartite Ramanujan graphs is at least as easy as constructing non-bipartite ones: the double-cover of a d-regular non-bipartite Ramanujan graph is a d-regular bipartite Ramanujan graph. For many applications of expander graphs, we refer the reader to [HLW06]. For those applications of expanders that just require upper bounds on the second eigenvalue, one can use bipartite Ramanujan graphs. Some applications actually require bipartite expanders, while others require the non-bipartite ones. For example, the explicit constructions of error correcting codes of Sipser and Spielman [SS96] require non-bipartite expanders, while the improvements of their construction [Zém01, RS06, AS06] require bipartite Ramanujan expanders.

3   2-Lifts and The Matching Polynomial

For a graph G, let m_i denote the number of matchings in G with i edges. Set $m_0 = 1$. Heilmann and Lieb [HL72] defined the *matching polynomial* of G to be the polynomial

$$\mu_G(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \geq 0} x^{n-2i}(-1)^i m_i,$$

where n is the number of vertices in the graph. They proved two remarkable theorems about the matching polynomial that we will exploit in this paper.

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 4.2 in [HL72]). *For every graph G, $\mu_G(x)$ has only real roots.*

Theorem 3.2 (Theorem 4.3 in [HL72]). *For every graph G of maximum degree d, all of the roots of $\mu_G(x)$ have absolute value at most $2\sqrt{d-1}$.*

The preceding theorems will allow us to prove the existence of infinite families of d-regular bipartite Ramanujan graphs. To handle the irregular case, we will require a refinement of them due to Godsil. This refinement uses the concept of a *path tree*, which was also introduced by Godsil (see [God81] or [God93, Section 6]). Recall that a path in G is a walk that does not visit any vertex twice.

Definition 3.3. Given a graph G and a vertex u, the path tree $T(G, u)$ contains one vertex for every path in G (with distinct vertices) that starts at u. Two paths are adjacent if one is a maximal subpath of the other.

Theorem 3.4 ([God81]). *Let $T(G, u)$ be a path tree of G. Then the matching polynomial of G divides the characteristic polynomial of the adjacency matrix of $T(G, u)$. In particular, all of the roots of $\mu_G(x)$ are real with absolute value at most $\rho(T(G, u))$.*

Note that the paths that define a path-tree are themselves non-backtracking walks (as defined in Section 2.3) and therefore every path tree of a graph is a finite induced subgraph of its universal cover. Hence Theorem 3.4 implies that the roots of the matching polynomial of a graph are bounded in absolute value by the spectral radius of its universal cover.

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be a graph and let T be its universal cover. Then the roots of the matching polynomial of G are bounded in absolute value by the spectral radius of T.*

Proof. Let u be any vertex of G and let P be the path tree rooted at u. Note that P is an induced subgraph of T, so A_P is a submatrix of A_T. By Theorem 3.4, the roots of μ_G are bounded by

$$\|A_P\|_2 = \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \|A_P x\|_2 = \sup_{\|y\|_2=1, \text{supp}(y) \subset P} \|A_T y\|_2 \leq \sup_{\|y\|_2=1} \|A_T y\|_2 = \rho(T),$$

as desired. $\qquad\square$

We remark that one can directly prove an upper bound of $2\sqrt{d-1}$ on the spectral radius of a path tree of d-regular graph and an upper bound of $\sqrt{c-1}+\sqrt{d-1}$ on the spectral radius of a path tree of a (c,d)-regular bipartite graph without considering infinite trees. We point the reader to Section 5.6 of Godsil's book [God93] for an elementary argument.

We will now establish an important relationship between the matching polynomial of a graph and its 2-lifts. It is convenient to order the m edges of a graph G arbitrarily; using this ordering, we denote the edges by $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ and a signing of the edges by $s \in \{\pm 1\}^m$. We then let A_s denote the signed adjacency matrix corresponding to s. Given a signing $s \in \{\pm 1\}^m$, we define $f_s(x)$ to be characteristic polynomial of A_s.

Theorem 3.6.
$$\mathbb{E}_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m} [f_s(x)] = \mu_G(x).$$

Proof. Let $\text{sym}(S)$ denote the set of permutations of a set S and let $(-1)^\pi$ denote the sign of a permutation π (i.e., the number of inversions in π). Expanding the determinant as a sum over permutations $\sigma \in \text{sym}([n])$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_s [\det(xI - A_s)] = \mathbb{E}_s \left[\sum_{\sigma \in \text{sym}([n])} (-1)^\sigma \prod_{i=1}^n (xI - A_s)_{i,\sigma(i)} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^n x^{n-k} \sum_{S \subset [n], |S|=k} \sum_{\pi \in \text{sym}(S)} \mathbb{E}_s \left[(-1)^\pi \prod_{i \in S} (A_s)_{i,\pi(i)} \right]$$

where π denotes the part of σ with $\sigma(i) \neq i$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^n x^{n-k} \sum_{S \subset [n], |S|=k} \sum_{\pi \in \text{sym}(S)} \mathbb{E}_s \left[(-1)^\pi \prod_{i \in S} s_{i,\pi(i)} \right].$$

Observe that since the s_{ij} are independent with $\mathbb{E}[s_{ij}] = 0$, only those products which contain even powers (0 or 2) of the s_{ij} survive. Thus, we may restrict our attention to the permutations π which contain only orbits of size two. These are just the perfect matchings on S. There are no perfect matchings when $|S|$ is odd; otherwise, each matching consists of $|S|/2$ inversions. Snce $\mathbb{E}_s \left[s_{ij}^2 \right] = 1$, we are left with

$$\mathbb{E}_s [\det(xI - A_s)] = \sum_{k=0}^n x^{n-k} \sum_{|S|=k} \sum_{\text{matching } \pi \text{ on } S} (-1)^{|S|/2} \cdot 1 = \mu_G(x),$$

as desired. $\qquad\square$

To construct good lifts, we need to show that there is a signing s so that the largest root of $f_s(x)$ is at most the largest root of $\mu_G(x)$. To do this, we prove that the polynomials $\{f_s(x)\}_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m}$ are what we call an interlacing family. We define interlacing families and examine their properties in the next section.

4   Interlacing Families

Definition 4.1. We say that a polynomial $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1}(x - \alpha_i)$ *interlaces* a polynomial $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{n}(x - \beta_i)$ if

$$\beta_1 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \beta_2 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \cdots \leq \alpha_{n-1} \leq \beta_n$$

We say that g *strictly interlaces* f if all of these inequalities are strict. We say that polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ have a *common interlacing* if there is a polynomial g so that g interlaces f_i for each i.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ be polynomials of the same degree that are real-rooted and have positive leading coefficients. Define*

$$f_\emptyset = \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_i.$$

If $f_1, \ldots, f_k$ have a common interlacing, then there exists an i so that the largest root of f_i is at most the largest root of $f_\emptyset$.

Proof. Let the polynomials be of degree n. Let g be a polynomial that interlaces all of the f_i, and let α_{n-1} be the largest root of g. As each f_i has a positive leading coefficient, it is positive for sufficiently large x. As each f_i has exactly one root that is at least α_{n-1}, each f_i is non-positive at α_{n-1}. So, $f_\emptyset$ is also non-positive at α_{n-1}, and eventually becomes positive. This tells us that $f_\emptyset$ has a root that is at least α_{n-1}, and so its largest root is at least α_{n-1}. Let β_n be this root.

As $f_\emptyset$ is the sum of the f_i, there must be some i for which $f_i(\beta_n) \geq 0$. As f_i has at most one root that is at least α_{n-1}, and $f_i(\alpha_{n-1}) \leq 0$, the largest root of f_i is it at least α_{n-1} and at most β_n. $\square$

One can show that the assumptions of the lemma imply that $f_\emptyset$ is itself a real rooted polynomial. However, we will not require this fact.

To see what can go wrong if the polynomials do not have a common interlacing, consider the sum of the polynomials $(x + 5)(x - 9)(x - 10)$ and $(x + 6)(x - 1)(x - 8)$. It has roots at approximately -5.3, 6.4, and 7.4. Its largest root is smaller than the largest root of both polynomials of which it is the sum.

Definition 4.3. Let $S_1, \ldots, S_m$ be finite sets and for every $s_1 \in S_1, \ldots, s_m \in S_m$ let $f_{s_1, \ldots, s_m}(x)$ be a real-rooted degree n polynomial with positive leading coefficient. For every partial assignment $s_1 \in S_1, \ldots, s_k \in S_k$, define

$$f_{s_1, \ldots, s_k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{s_{k+1} \in S_{k+1}, \ldots, s_m \in S_m} f_{s_1, \ldots, s_k, s_{k+1}, \ldots, s_m},$$

as well as

$$f_\emptyset \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{s_1 \in S_1, \ldots, s_m \in S_m} f_{s_1, \ldots, s_m}.$$

We say that the polynomials $\{f_{s_1,\ldots,s_m}\}_{s_1,\ldots,s_m}$ form an *interlacing family* if for all $k = 0,\ldots,m-1$, and all $s_1 \in S_1,\ldots,s_k \in S_k$, the polynomials

$$\{f_{s_1,\ldots,s_k,t}\}_{t \in S_{k+1}}$$

have a common interlacing.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $S_1,\ldots,S_m$ be finite sets and let $\{f_{s_1,\ldots,s_m}\}$ be an interlacing family of polynomials. Then, there exits some $s_1,\ldots,s_m \in S_1 \times \cdots \times S_m$ so that the largest root of $f_{s_1,\ldots,s_m}$ is less than the largest root of $f_\emptyset$.*

Proof. From the definition of an interlacing family, we know that $f_{s_1},\ldots,f_{s_k}$ have a common interlacing and that their sum is $f_\emptyset$. So, Lemma 4.2 tells us that one of the polynomials $\{f_{s_1}\}_{s_1 \in S_1}$ has largest root at most the largest root of $f_\emptyset$. We now proceed inductively. For any $s_1,\ldots,s_k$, we know that the polynomials $f_{s_1,\ldots,s_k,s_{k+1}}$ for $s_{k+1} \in S_{k+1}$ have a common interlacing and that their sum is $f_{s_1,\ldots,s_k}$. So, for some choice of s_{k+1} the largest root of the polynomial $f_{s_1,\ldots,s_{k+1}}$ is at most the largest root of $f_{s_1,\ldots,s_k}$. □

We will prove that the polynomials $\{f_s\}_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m}$ defined in Section 3 are an interlacing family. Our proof will use the following result, which seems to have been discovered a number of times

Lemma 4.5 (Proposition 1.35 in [Fis08], essentially). *Let f and g be (univariate) polynomials of degree n such that, for all $\alpha, \beta > 0$, $\alpha f + \beta g$ has n real roots. Then f and g have a common interlacing.*

The difference between the statement above and the one that appears in [Fis08] is that Fisk requires the polynomials to have disjoint roots so that the interlacing is strict. As we do not require a strict interlacing, we can drop this requirement. The proof in either case is the same, and easy.

As multiplication by a non-zero constant does not change the roots of a polynomial, the only relevant parameter in the lemma is α/β. Because of this, an equivalent condition (and the one we will use) is that $\lambda f + (1 - \lambda)g$ has n real roots for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

5   The main result

Our proof that the polynomials $\{f_s\}_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m}$ are an interlacing family relies on the following generalization of the fact that the matching polynomial is real rooted. It amounts to saying that if we pick each sign independently with any probabilities, then the resulting polynomial is still real rooted.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $p_1,\ldots,p_m$ be numbers in $[0, 1]$. Then, the following polynomial is real rooted*

$$\sum_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m} \left(\prod_{i:s_i=1} p_i \right) \left(\prod_{i:s_i=-1} (1 - p_i) \right) f_s(x).$$

We will prove this theorem using machinery that we develop in the next section.

Theorem 5.2. *The polynomials $\{f_s\}_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m}$ are an interlacing family.*

Proof. We will show that for every $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, every partial assignment $s_1 \in \pm 1, \ldots, s_k \in \pm 1$, and every $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, the polynomial

$$\lambda f_{s_1,\ldots,s_k,1}(x) + (1 - \lambda)f_{s_1,\ldots,s_k,-1}(x)$$

is real rooted. The theorem will then follow from Lemma 4.5.

To show that the above polynomial is real rooted, we apply Theorem 5.1 with $p_{k+1} = \lambda$, $p_{k+2}, \ldots, p_m = 1/2$, and $p_i = (1 + s_i)/2$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. $\square$

Theorem 5.3. *Let G be a graph with adjacency matrix A and universal cover T. Then there is a signing s of A so that all of the eigenvalues of A_s are at most $\rho(T)$. In particular, for d-regular graphs, the eigenvalues of A_s are at most $2\sqrt{d-1}$.*

Proof. The first statement follows immediately from Theorems 4.4 and 5.2 and Lemma 3.5. The second statement follows by noting that the universal cover of a $d-$regular graph is a $d-$regular tree, which has spectral radius bounded by $2\sqrt{d-1}$, or by directly appealing to Theorem 3.2. $\square$

Theorem 5.4. *For every $d \geq 3$ there is an infinite sequence of $d-$regular bipartite Ramanujan graphs.*

Proof. The complete bipartite graph of degree d is Ramanujan. By Lemma 3.1 of [BL06] and Theorem 5.3, for every d-regular bipartite Ramanujan graph G, there is a 2-lift in which every non-trivial eigenvalue is at most $2\sqrt{d-1}$. As the 2-lift of a bipartite graph is bipartite, and the eigenvalues of a bipartite graph are symmetric about 0, this 2-lift is also a regular bipartite Ramanujan graph.

Thus, for every d-regular bipartite Ramanujan graph G, there is another d-regular bipartite Ramanujan graph with twice as many vertices. $\square$

Theorem 5.5. *For every $c, d \geq 3$, there is an infinite sequence of (c, d)-biregular bipartite Ramanujan graphs, with nontrivial eigenvalues bounded by $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$.*

Proof. Let $K_{c,d}$ be the complete bipartite graph with c vertices on one side and d on the other. The adjacency matrix of this graph has rank 2, so its nontrivial eigenvalues are zero and it is Ramanujan.

We will construct an infinite sequence of (c, d)-biregular bipartite graphs. Let G be any (c, d)-biregular bipartite Ramanujan graph. The universal cover of a (c, d)-biregular graph is the infinite (c, d)-biregular tree $T_{c,d}^\infty$, which has vertices of degree c and d at alternating levels. Godsil and Mohar [GM88] and Li and Sole [LS96] have shown that the spectral radius of $T_{c,d}^\infty$ is equal to $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$. Thus, Theorem 5.3 tells us that there is a 2-lift of G with all new eigenvalues at most $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$. As this graph is bipartite, all of the non-trivial eigenvalues have absolute value at most $\sqrt{c-1} + \sqrt{d-1}$. So, the resulting 2-lift is a larger (c, d)-biregular bipartite Ramanujan graph. $\square$

To conclude the section, we remark that repeated application of Theorem 5.3 can be used to generate an infinite sequence of irregular Ramanujan graphs from *any* finite irregular bipartite Ramanujan graph, since all of the lifts produced will have the same universal cover. In contrast, Lubotzky and Nagnibeda [LN98] have shown that there exist infinite trees that cover infinitely many finite graphs but such that none of the finite graphs are Ramanujan.

6   Real stable polynomials

In this section we will establish the real-rootedness of a class of polynomials which includes the polynomials of Theorem 5.1. We will do this by considering a multivariate generalization of real-rootedness called *real stability* (see, e.g., the surveys [Pem12, Wag11]). In particular, we will show that the univariate polynomials we are interested in are the images, under a well-behaved linear transformation, of a multivariate real stable polynomial.

Definition 6.1. A multivariate polynomial $f \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ is called *real stable* if

$$f(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \neq 0$$

whenever the imaginary part of every z_i is strictly positive.

Real stable polynomials enjoy a number of useful closure properties. In particular, it is easy to see that if $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $g(y_1, \ldots y_j)$ are real stable then $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k)g(y_1, \ldots, y_j)$ is real stable. One can also check that the real stability of $f(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ implies the real stability of $f(x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, c)$ for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$ (see, e.g., Lemma 2.4 in [Wag11]).

In an important series of works [BB09a], [BB09b], [Brä11], Borcea and Brändén completely characterize the linear operators $T : \mathbb{R}[z_1, \ldots, z_n] \to \mathbb{R}[z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ that preserve real stability, and give a tractable procedure for testing whether a given T satisfies this property. In this paper we will only be interested in differential operators of a certain kind, for which an earlier result of Lieb and Sokal suffices.

Lemma 6.2 (Lemma 2.1 of [LS81]). *Let* $f(z_1, \ldots, z_n) + wg(z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \ldots, z_n, w]$ *be a real stable of degree at most 1 in* z_j. *Then*

$$f(z_1, \ldots, z_n) - \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$$

is also real stable.

An elementary proof of this lemma is provided in Wagner's survey [Wag11], Lemma 3.2. The lemma easily implies the following useful and well-known corollary by induction.

Corollary 6.3. *For any real stable polynomials* $f(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ *and* $t(w_1, \ldots, w_m)$ *with* $m \leq n$ *that both have degree at most 1 in the variables* z_j *and* w_j *for* $1 \leq j \leq m$, *the polynomial*

$$t\left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \ldots, -\frac{\partial}{\partial z_m}\right) f(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$$

is also real stable.

We will also use the following fact, first proved by Borcea and Brändén, which follows by noting that semidefinite matrices have square roots and that the characteristic polynomial of a symmetric matrix is real-rooted.

Lemma 6.4 (Proposition 2.4 in [BB08]). *Let* $A_1, \ldots, A_m$ *be positive semidefinite matrices. Then*

$$\det\left[z_1 A_1 + \cdots + z_m A_m\right]$$

is real stable.

Using these tools, we prove our main technical result on real rootedness. To ease notation, we will write ∂_z^α for the differential operator $\prod_i \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\right)^{\alpha_i}$, $\alpha \in \{0,1\}^m$.

Theorem 6.5. *Let $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ be vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and let $p_1, \ldots, p_m$ be real numbers in $[0,1]$. Then every (univariate) polynomial of the form*

$$P(x) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{S \subseteq [m]} \left(\prod_{i \in S} p_i\right) \left(\prod_{i \notin S} 1 - p_i\right) \det\left[xI + \sum_{i \in S} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \notin S} b_i b_i^T\right]$$

is real rooted.

Proof. We start by defining a related multivariate polynomial. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_m$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ be formal variables and define

$$Q(x, u_1, \ldots, u_m, v_1, \ldots, v_m) = \det\left[xI + \sum_{i \in S} u_i a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \notin S} v_i b_i b_i^T\right].$$

Q is clearly real stable by Lemma 6.4 and the degree of each u_i and v_i in Q is one since it is multiplied by a rank-one matrix inside the determinant. For $p_i \in [0,1]$, we will consider operators of the form

$$T_i = 1 + p_i \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} + (1 - p_i)\frac{\partial}{\partial v_i} \overset{\text{def}}{=} t_i(-\partial_u^i, -\partial_v^i)$$

for $t_i(u_i, v_i) = 1 - p_i u_i - (1 - p_i)v_i$. Each polynomial t_i is real stable because it is linear with real coefficients and the coefficients have the same sign. Hence the product $\prod_{i=1}^m t_i \in \mathbb{R}[u_1, \ldots, u_m, v_1, \ldots, v_m]$ is also real stable and so by Corollary 6.3 the operator

$$\prod_{i=1}^m T_i = \sum_{\substack{S,T \subseteq [m] \\ S \cap T = \emptyset}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} p_i\right) \left(\prod_{i \in T} 1 - p_i\right) \partial_u^S \partial_v^T$$

preserves the real stability of Q. Finally, as substitution preserves real stability, we get that

$$\hat{P}(x) = \left(\sum_{\substack{S,T \subseteq [m] \\ S \cap T = \emptyset}} \left(\prod_{i \in S} p_i\right) \left(\prod_{i \in T} 1 - p_i\right) \partial_u^S \partial_v^T Q(x, \vec{u}, \vec{v})\right)\Bigg|_{u_1 = \cdots = u_m = v_1 = \cdots = v_m = 0}$$

is real stable. As it is univariate, this is equivalent to saying that it is real rooted.

To finish the proof, we show that $P(x) = \hat{P}(x)$ by looking at each coefficient individually. As the only terms that appear in $\hat{P}(x)$ are the ones that have exactly the variables that are being differentiated, the coefficient of x^{d-k} in $\hat{P}(x)$ is

$$\sum_{\substack{|R|+|W|=k \\ R \cap W = \emptyset}} \left(\prod_{i \in R} p_i\right) \left(\prod_{i \in W} 1 - p_i\right) \det\left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \in W} b_i b_i^T\right].$$

On the other hand, the Cauchy–Binet formula tells us that for each $S \subseteq [m]$,

$$\det\left[xI + \sum_{i \in S} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \notin S} b_i b_i^T\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{d} x^{d-k} \sum_{|T|=k} \det\left[\sum_{i \in T \cap S} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \in T \setminus S} b_i b_i^T\right].$$

So,

$$P(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d} x^{d-k} \sum_{S \subseteq [m]} \left(\prod_{i \in S} p_i\right)\left(\prod_{i \notin S} 1 - p_i\right) \sum_{|T|=k} \det\left[\sum_{i \in T \cap S} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \in T \setminus S} b_i b_i^T\right].$$

By changing the order of summation, and writing $S = R \cup Q$ where $R \subseteq T$ and $Q \subseteq [m] \setminus T$, we can write the coefficient of x^{d-k} in $P(x)$ as

$$\sum_{|T|=k} \sum_{R \subseteq T} \det\left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \in T \setminus R} b_i b_i^T\right] \sum_{Q \subseteq [m] \setminus T} \prod_{i \in Q \cup R} p_i \prod_{i \in [m] \setminus Q \setminus R} (1 - p_i)$$

$$= \sum_{|T|=k} \sum_{R \subseteq T} \det\left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \in T \setminus R} b_i b_i^T\right] \prod_{i \in R} p_i \prod_{i \in T \setminus R} (1 - p_i)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{|R|+|W|=k \\ R \cap W = \emptyset}} \left(\prod_{i \in R} p_i\right)\left(\prod_{i \in W} 1 - p_i\right) \det\left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i a_i^T + \sum_{i \in W} b_i b_i^T\right],$$

where in the second-to-last equality we have used the identity

$$\sum_{Q \subseteq [m] \setminus T} \prod_{i \in Q} p_i \prod_{i \in [m] \setminus T \setminus Q} (1 - p_i) = 1,$$

and in the last equality we have set $W = T \setminus R$. The expression we obtain matches the one we found for the coefficient of x^{d-k} in $\hat{P}(x)$. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let d be the maximum degree of G. We need to prove that the polynomial

$$\sum_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m} \left(\prod_{i:s_i=1} p_i\right)\left(\prod_{i:s_i=-1} (1 - p_i)\right) \det\left[xI - A_s\right]$$

is real rooted. This is equivalent to proving that the the following polynomial is real rooted

$$\sum_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m} \left(\prod_{i:s_i=1} p_i\right)\left(\prod_{i:s_i=-1} (1 - p_i)\right) \det\left[xI + dI - A_s\right], \tag{4}$$

as their roots only differ by d.

We now observe that the matrix $dI - A_s$ is a signed Laplacian matrix of G plus a nonnegative diagonal matrix. For each edge (u, v), define the rank 1-matrices

$$L^1_{u,v} = (e_u - e_v)(e_u - e_v)^T, \quad \text{and}$$
$$L^{-1}_{u,v} = (e_u + e_v)(e_u + e_v)^T,$$

where e_u is the elementary unit vector in direction u. Since the original graph had maximum degree d, we have

$$dI - A_s = \sum_{(u,v) \in E} L_{u,v}^{s_{u,v}} + D,$$

for some nonnegative diagonal matrix $D = \sum_{u \in V} d_u e_u e_u^T$, which does not depend on s and which is zero when G is regular. If we now set $a_{u,v} = (e_u - e_v)$ and $b_{u,v} = (e_u + e_v)$, we can express the polynomial in (4) as

$$\sum_{s \in \{\pm 1\}^m} \left(\prod_{i:s_i=1} p_i \right) \left(\prod_{i:s_i=-1} (1-p_i) \right) \det \left[xI + \sum_{u \in V} d_u e_u e_u^T + \sum_{s_{u,v}=1} a_{u,v} a_{u,v}^T + \sum_{s_{u,v}=-1} b_{u,v} b_{u,v}^T \right].$$

The fact that this polynomial is real rooted now follows from Theorem 6.5, by creating auxiliary p_i's all equal to one corresponding to the fixed $d_u e_u e_u^T$ terms. $\square$

7 Conclusion

We find it pleasant that our proof of the existence of Ramanujan graphs is directly connected to bounds on the spectral radii of infinite trees, which are the same objects that witness their optimality.

We conclude by drawing an analogy between our proof technique and the probabilistic method, which relies at its root on the fact that for every random variable $X : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, there is an $\omega \in \Omega$ for which $X(\omega) \leq \mathbb{E}[X]$. We have shown that for certain special polynomial-valued random variables $P : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}[x]$, there must be an ω with $\lambda_{max}(P(\omega)) \leq \lambda_{max}(\mathbb{E}[P])$. In fact it is possible to define interlacing families in greater generality than we have done earlier, using probabilistic notation. In particular, we call a polynomial-valued random variable P *useful* if P is deterministic or there exist disjoint non-trivial events $E_1, \ldots, E_k$ with $\sum_{i \leq k} \Pr[E_i] = 1$ such that the polynomials $\{\mathbb{E}[P|E_i]\}_{i \leq k}$ have a common interlacing and each polynomial $\mathbb{E}[P|E_i]$ is itself useful. The conclusion of Theorem 4.4 continues to hold for this definition, and we suspect it will be useful in non-product settings. In the case of this paper, the events E_i are particularly simple and correspond to setting one sign of a lift to be $+1$ or -1, and the sequence of polynomials $f_\emptyset, f_{s_1}, \ldots, f_{s_1, \ldots, s_m}$ encountered forms a martingale (a fact that we do not use, but may be exploitable).

Like many applications of the probabilistic method, our proof does not yield a polynomial-time algorithm. In the particular case of random lifts, the polynomial $f_\emptyset$ is itself a matching polynomial, which is $\#P$-hard to compute in general. It is an interesting open problem to find computationally efficient analogues of our method.

References

[ABG10] Louigi Addario-Berry and Simon Griffiths. The spectrum of random lifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.4097*, 2010.

[AL06] Alon Amit and Nathan Linial. Random lifts of graphs: edge expansion. *Combinatorics Probability and Computing*, 15(3):317, 2006.

[ALM02] Alon Amit, Nathan Linial, and Jiří Matoušek. Random lifts of graphs: independence and chromatic number. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 20(1):1–22, 2002.

[AS06] Alexei Ashikhmin and Vitaly Skachek. Decoding of expander codes at rates close to capacity. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 52(12):5475–5485, 2006.

[BB08] Julius Borcea and Petter Brändén. Applications of stable polynomials to mixed determinants: Johnson's conjectures, unimodality, and symmetrized Fischer products. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 143(2):205–223, 2008.

[BB09a] Julius Borcea and Petter Brändén. The Lee–Yang and Pólya–Schur programs, I. Linear operators preserving stability. *Invent. Math.*, 177(3):541–569, 2009.

[BB09b] Julius Borcea and Petter Brändén. The Lee–Yang and Pólya–Schur programs, II. Theory of stable polynomials and applications. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(12):1595–1631, 2009.

[BL06] Yonatan Bilu and Nathan Linial. Lifts, discrepancy and nearly optimal spectral gap*. *Combinatorica*, 26(5):495–519, 2006.

[Brä11] Petter Brändén. The Lee–Yang and Pólya–Schur programs, III. Zero–preservers on Bargmann–Fock spaces. *arXiv:1107.1809*, 2011.

[Chi92] Patrick Chiu. Cubic Ramanujan graphs. *Combinatorica*, 12(3):275–285, 1992.

[Cio06] Sebastian M Cioabă. Eigenvalues of graphs and a simple proof of a theorem of greenberg. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 416(2):776–782, 2006.

[Fis08] Steve Fisk. *Polynomials, roots, and interlacing*. arXiv:math/0612833 [math.CA], 2008.

[FL96] Keqin Feng and Wen-Ch'ing Winnie Li. Spectra of hypergraphs and applications. *Journal of number theory*, 60(1):1–22, 1996.

[Fri03] Joel Friedman. Relative expanders or weakly relatively ramanujan graphs. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 118(1):19–35, 2003.

[Fri08] Joel Friedman. *A proof of Alon's second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems*. Amer Mathematical Society, 2008.

[GM88] Chris D Godsil and Bojan Mohar. Walk generating functions and spectral measures of infinite graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 107:191–206, 1988.

[God81] C. D. Godsil. Matchings and walks in graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 5(3):285–297, 1981.

[God93] Chris Godsil. *Algebraic combinatorics*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1993.

[Gre95] Yoseph Greenberg. *On the spectrum of graphs and their universal covering*. PhD thesis, Hebrew University, 1995.

[HL72] Ole J Heilmann and Elliott H Lieb. Theory of monomer-dimer systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 25(3):190–232, 1972.

[HLW06]   Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson. Expander graphs and their applications. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 43(4):439–561, 2006.

[JL97]   Bruce W Jordan and Ron Livné. Ramanujan local systems on graphs. *Topology*, 36(5):1007–1024, 1997.

[LN98]   Alexander Lubotzky and Tatiana Nagnibeda. Not every uniform tree covers Ramanujan graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 74(2):202–212, 1998.

[LP10]   Nati Linial and Doron Puder. Word maps and spectra of random graph lifts. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 37(1):100–135, 2010.

[LPS88]   A. Lubotzky, R. Phillips, and P. Sarnak. Ramanujan graphs. *Combinatorica*, 8(3):261–277, 1988.

[LR05]   Nathan Linial and Eyal Rozenman. Random lifts of graphs: perfect matchings. *Combinatorica*, 25(4):407–424, 2005.

[LS81]   Elliott H. Lieb and Alan D. Sokal. A general lee-yang theorem for one-component and multicomponent ferromagnets. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 80(2):153–179, 1981.

[LS96]   Wen-Ch'ing Winnie Li and Patrick Solé. Spectra of regular graphs and hypergraphs and orthogonal polynomials. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 17(5):461–477, 1996.

[LSV11]   Eyal Lubetzky, Benny Sudakov, and Van Vu. Spectra of lifted ramanujan graphs. *Advances in Mathematics*, 227(4):1612–1645, 2011.

[Lub94]   Alexander Lubotzky. *Discrete Groups, Expanding Graphs and Invariant Measures*, volume 125. Birkhauser, 1994.

[Mar88]   G. A. Margulis. Explicit group theoretical constructions of combinatorial schemes and their application to the design of expanders and concentrators. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 24(1):39–46, July 1988.

[Mor94]   M. Morgenstern. Existance and explicit constructions of $q + 1$ regular Ramanujan graphs for every prime power q. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 62:44–62, 1994.

[Nil91]   A. Nilli. On the second eigenvalue of a graph. *Discrete Math*, 91:207–210, 1991.

[Pem12]   Robin Pemantle. Hyperbolicity and stable polynomials in combinatorics and probability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.3231*, 2012.

[Piz90]   Arnold K Pizer. Ramanujan graphs and Hecke operators. *Bulletin of the AMS*, 23(1), 1990.

[Pud12]   Doron Puder. Expansion of random graphs: New proofs, new results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5216*, 2012.

[RS80]   Michael Reed and Barry Simon. *Functional Analysis*, volume 1 of *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*. Academic Press, 1980.

[RS06]   Ron M Roth and Vitaly Skachek. Improved nearly-mds expander codes. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 52(8):3650–3661, 2006.

[SS96]   M. Sipser and D.A. Spielman. Expander codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42(6):1710–1722, Nov 1996.

[Wag11]   D. G. Wagner. Multivariate stable polynomials: theory and applications. *Bulletins of the American Mathematical Society*, 48(1):53–84, 2011.

[Zém01]   Gillés Zémor. On expander codes. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 47(2):835–837, 2001.